

## LUCIFER'S PRIMACY

### The Crisis in Obedience

by Solange Hertz

Quis ut Deus? The battle-cry and very name of St. Michael, our leader in the apocalyptic war, is a question: Who is like God? So capital a question inevitably suggests a prior one: Who wants to be like God? Someone must, or there would be no point in asking, Quis ut Deus? in the first place.

Answers to both are given clearly in Scripture, for God would not have us ignorant of truths so basic.

Who is like God? No one.

God himself told Moses, "There is none like me in all the earth!" (Ex. 9:14), and His true prophets have relayed the same message generation after generation.

But who wants to be like God? Someone.

Scripture says it is Lucifer, who promised himself in the beginning, "I will be like the Most High." Isaias tells us that before his fall he said in his heart, "I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God, I will sit in the mountain of the covenant, in the sides of the north. I will ascend above the height of the clouds" (Is. 14:13-14).

Losing heaven in no way shook his resolve, for his next official act, we might say, was to infect humanity with the same ambition. He persuaded Mother Eve to forsake her innocence precisely so that she and Adam might be "like gods," knowing not merely good, but evil as well, becoming like him who wants to be like God, so that today we stand warned by the Almighty:

"Remember the former age, for I am God, and there is no God beside, neither is there the like to me: Who show from the beginning the things that shall be last, and from ancient times the things that as yet are not done!" (Is. 46:9-10).

We hear the present situation in the Church is one no ordinary person can expect to cope with, for it is without precedent. This is ridiculous, betraying the rawest ignorance. From the very beginning humanity has been told about nothing else, prepared to face nothing else than the situation we face today. To understand "the things that shall be last, not yet done" in these latter times, we need only study "the ancient times" where they have already taken place. God said so.

We are conscripted in a battle being waged on earth, but which is not of earth and never began there. It began in heaven and was merely carried here by the enemy, a transposition now being worked out in flesh and blood, of a contest already decided once in heaven, where naked intellects and wills were first pitted against one another.

From the data of revelation, theologians long ago deduced its causes, progress and effects. There is no difficulty, therefore, in predicting its probable course here and its ultimate conclusion. Those who have kept their eyes in heaven rather than on the news media can tell us very much, for instance, about the character of the enemy chieftain and his fixed mode of operation. Only those who won't open their eyes need fight him in the dark.

+

The first thing to see is that the position of Lucifer in heaven before his fall was roughly analogous to that of the Pope here below. It would seem that he outranked St. Michael in hierarchical order, for Chapter 12 of the Apocalypse speaks of him as the great red dragon who was initially vested with power sufficient to subvert one third of the heavenly authorities, whereas St. Michael rises to command only after this subversion was under way.

"Satan was the supreme angelic spirit," says St. Gregory, "and was so created that he might preside over all the legions of angels" (Mor. IV,13). He was God's deputy, His Vicar, if you will, in the angelic government. Tertullian taught the same as St. Gregory, calling Lucifer "archangel" not because he was a member of this lower choir, but because he was "arch," or prince of all the angels, a view held almost universally by the Doctors and Fathers of the Church. St. Jerome, commenting on Psalm 23, said, "Satan had under his domination the nine choirs of angels, including both those who fell and those who remained faithful," a teaching approved by St. John Chrysostom and St. Augustine, and followed by St. Thomas and the scholastics.

The very name Lucifer, or Morning Star, was applied to Satan by the Fathers because he was indeed the brightest of the "stars" of God, preeminent in gifts of both nature and grace. It was, said St. Gregory, "the chief angel who sinned, being set over all the angelic hosts," and who "surpassed them in brightness, and was by comparison the most illustrious among them" (Hom. 34 in Evang.). It stands to reason that only a spirit with the greatest authority could have influenced angelic officialdom. How could a lesser influence the mighty above him?

Like all successful revolutions, the one in heaven was not concocted from below, but at the top, by traitors at the summit. As vulgar wisdom has it, fish rots from the head. The reason is theological.

St. Thomas adds that the motive of sinning existed more in the highest angel than in the lower, pride being the impelling motive. Lucifer's sin did not arise from any proneness to evil, having been created wholly good by God; and being a pure spirit, there was no question of passion or sensuality such as might arise from a material body. He led the others who fell, and constituted so severe a scandal to the good angels, by the fact that his sin arose from the free choice of his will aspiring to even greater excellence.

Finally, our Lord himself would seem to affirm the primacy of Satan when He referred to "Satan and his angels" (Matt. 25:24), a position he evidently still enjoys in hell, God's gifts being without repentance, for good or ill. In Chapter 41 of the Book of Job, the passage describing Leviathan, figure of Satan, dubs him flatly "king of all the sons of pride."

We might note in passing that St. Gaudentius, friend of St. Ambrose, summed up sacred Tradition on the difficult parable of the unjust steward by applying this figure to Satan. His authority was allowed to continue, says he, "for the correction of mankind, so that we, flying from the malignant cruelty of this so evil steward, might run together toward the compassionate God, through whose power and mercy we can be delivered from every assault . . . seeing that the steward also is subject to the power of God. . . The devil wasted the substance of his Lord when he sought the ruin of mankind . . . And this most wicked one, reckoning the death of man as his profit, is consumed with anxiety because the Lord is about to take away his power over others.

"And since he is unable to will what is good, and is ashamed to ask mercy through repentance, he thinks within himself how he may still have power over the debtors of his Lord (that is, over those involved in the debt of sin) not alone by open persecution, but also, under the pretext of benevolence, by deceiving them with smooth words, so that seduced by his false kindness they may more readily receive him into their houses since together with him they must be judged forever." (PL 20, col. 971, Sermo 18)

To believe that the one our Lord called "the prince of this world" exercises no authority in it is to fly in the face of reality. Not only does God give him limited authority to tempt and afflict us, but we place ourselves willingly under his jurisdiction when we follow his satanic wishes. Those who actually "receive him into their houses" are his communicants, who welcome him sub tectum.

Satan was created to rule. In THE ANGEL WORLD, Fr. Simon Blackmore, S.J. concludes, "The opinion that Lucifer's influence in seducing other angels arose from his preeminence and leadership is supported by eminent theologians. It is based on certain scriptural texts, which would not be altogether cogent unless maintained by the authoritative exposition of the early Fathers of the Greek and Latin Church." He cites Origen as saying, "The opinion prevails among very many that the devil in his apostasy persuaded vast numbers to follow him, and even to this day these are called his angels." (Lib. I PERIARCH. in proem.).

+

Before drawing the analogy between the situation of the angels before Eden and that of Catholics today, some important background must be filled in: Scripture tells us, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," making angels before the material universe and man. We must understand that the word "heavens" here does not mean that its citizens enjoyed the Beatific Vision. It merely means that they were entirely spiritual and inhabited a non-material realm distinct from earth.

Angels were not created outright in the intimacy with God which the good ones now enjoy before the throne of the Lamb. Like us, they had their period of probation, individually and collectively, for the Beatific Vision was a supernatural destiny in no way due them as a matter of course. Like us they need, and were given, grace to attain it. Had they been enjoying the vision of God they could never have sinned, for God is the end of all possible desires.

Expounding the tradition of the Church, Fr. Blackman explains they received an infusion of grace with all its virtues, especially faith, together with a capacity to posit super-

natural acts. To test this faith there necessarily followed a confrontation with revelation, whereby the angels chose or rejected obedience to the plans of their Creator. Again like us, the revelation given them was that of the Most Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation -- together with the Blessed Virgin, by means of whom the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity was to become man and rule over all creation, both material and angelic. Our Lady was shown to them under the "sign" St. John speaks of in Chapter 12 of the Apocalypse.

It was that, apparently, which drove Lucifer to fury. Indignant at the prospect of submitting his superior angelic nature to a lower, human nature, he contended that the Hypostatic Union should in all justice and propriety be consummated with himself. Venerable Mary of Agreda reveals that Lucifer had previously "tarried with inordinate pleasure" in the consciousness of his God-given excellences, in due course conceiving hatred for God for not having given him more, and at the revelation of the Incarnation, he quite simply coveted the stature and gifts reserved to divinity. He wanted to be the Christ, an angelic Christ. In other words, he wanted to be like God.

In her exegesis of the aforementioned Chapter 12, Ven. Agreda describes how, "With the utmost boasting he spoke in the presence of the Woman symbolized in the heavenly sign: 'This Son, which that Woman is to bring forth, is of lower nature than mine: I shall devour Him and destroy Him. I shall lead on my followers against Him, I shall spread my doctrines against His decrees and against His laws which He shall set up. I shall wage perpetual war and contradiction against Him.'"

And she records Lucifer as blaspheming, "Unjust is God in raising human nature above the angelic. I am the most exalted and beautiful angel, and the triumph belongs to me. It is I who am to place my throne above the stars and who shall be like unto the Highest; I will subject myself to no one of an inferior nature, and I will not consent that anyone take precedence of me or be greater than I."

To which St. Michael retorts, Quis ut Deus? And the battle is on. "For the obedient and holy angels, filled with an ardent desire of hastening the glory of the Most High and the honor of the Incarnate Word, asked permission, and as it were, the consent of God, to resist and contradict the dragon, and the permission was granted." Resting on the only authority higher than Lucifer's, namely God's, the good angels could resist their supreme grand master legitimately -- in itself proof of their perfect obedience.

+

As the angels' first divinely appointed leader, Lucifer had already succeeded in subverting angels of all ranks, whose test of fidelity lay precisely in a choice between obedience to his perverted directives or to God's decree. They could not obey one without disobeying the other. Lucifer's power was awesome, bestowed by the Almighty, and we may be sure he used it fully.

Now cast out of heaven, out of grace, he is left to his own natural talents and resources at the head of his legions, but these are considerable, and he continues his defiance by using all his gifts to win men to his cause. Pursuing the Woman and her Son, he is constrained by the very fact of the Incarnation to shift his revolutionary activities to human affairs on earth. St. John describes the hostilities in the past tense because they have been concluded in heaven, where he saw them waged in vision from Patmos, but his report is not mere history. As he well knew, it is prophecy. Were it not, there would be little point in relaying it.

Our battle, however, has not only the precedent of the one in heaven. First waged on high between Lucifer and St. Michael under the Sign of the Incarnation, it was waged a second time between Satan's stand-in, the high priest Caiphas, and the Incarnate Word himself in Jerusalem. It is called the Passion, and to read an account of it we have only to turn to the Gospels.

The parallels are ominous, and fraught with portent for us. In each case those who wished to remain faithful to God had to resolve a crisis of obedience arising from abuse of authority exercised by a legally established superior. In heaven the good angels had to choose God above Lucifer, their prince whom God had set over them; in Jerusalem the faithful Jews had to disregard their divinely constituted high priest in order to confess the divinity of Christ. In heaven the battle-cry was "Who is like God?" In Jerusalem it was our Lord's divine "I AM" which unleashed the hostilities. Through generations of martyrs the pattern has never changed in its main outlines.

In both cases many individuals were eternally lost as the result of their false allegiance to the secondary power, but Satan's defeat was nonetheless equally decisive. Our Lord,

who in the beginning "saw Satan like lightning falling from heaven" (Luke 10:18), told His followers just before His Passion, "Now is the judgment of the world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out!" (John 12:31) assuring us that we have only to follow in His footsteps.

The last phase of the battle is now in progress, so we know it too must be resolved through some similar crisis of obedience. As the angels confronted Lucifer and his cohorts, as our Lord confronted Caiaphas and those who "sat on the chair of Moses," so must the Church in due time confront the Antichrist on the Chair of Peter. To believe otherwise is to fly in the face of Scripture.

St. Augustine, like most Fathers of the Church, minced no words: "The Antichrist will be seated in the temple, that is, the Church, as if the people of God were formed of a multitude of the impious" (Commentary on Psalm 7). What better sign and wonder with which to subvert the elect, by tempting them to avoid conflict by taking refuge in technical "obedience?" Lucifer's pride alone demands that his "image" usurp the Papacy, let alone His desire to rule the world.

+

The strategy has been mapped out from the beginning, the enemy well schooled in it. There's no need to quote from works of uncertain authorship such as "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion" to prove that Lucifer plots for the Pontificate. At the close of the last century, when the last details of the conspiracy were worked out, several of its leading "theologians" had already formalized and published the basic ideology.

The renegade priest Abbé Roca was one. Become a Rosicrucian adept, he was instrumental in introducing kabbalistic mysticism into the highest echelons of Masonry. As the intimate of its most influential initiates, he travelled throughout Europe and the United States preaching the "divine synarchy" soon to be formed under the authority of a Pope converted to a new, scientific Christianity. His works -- a veritable summa of the new universal Catholicism destined to "consecrate the modern world" -- offer proof that the present devastation of the Church is no work of the Holy Spirit, but rather the result of carefully laid plans perfected over a century ago by her deadliest enemies.

Hear what he says in GLORIEUX CENTENAIRE: "The former Papacy, the former priesthood, will gladly abdicate in favor of the Pontificate and priests of the future who will be those of the past converted and transfigured in view of the scientific organization of the Planet in the light of the Gospel. And this new Church, although she will retain nothing of scholastic discipline or the rudimentary shape of the former Church, will nevertheless receive her Consecration and Canon Law from Rome."

And again, "The Convert of the Vatican, like Christ, will not need to reveal a new doctrine to his brothers; he will not need to drive Christianity or the world outright into paths other than those followed by the people under the secret inspiration of the Spirit, but simply to confirm them in this modern civilization. . . . The Pontiff will rest content with confirming and glorifying the work of the "spirit of Christ" or the Christ-Spirit in the public mind, and thanks to the privilege of his personal Infallibility, he will declare canonically urbi et orbi that the present civilization is the legitimate daughter of the Gospel of social Redemption."

To clarify this passage we must add that "Christ" to Abbé Roca is not the one Catholics worship, but, to use his own words, "Humanity itself in principle, divine Humanity." In THE END OF THE OLD WORLD he says, "There will be a new religion; there will be new dogma, new ritual, a new priesthood, whose relation to the Church now toppling will be exactly the same which the Catholic Church bore to her deceased mother the Mosaic Church."

"An immolation is in the offing," says he, "which will be a solemn expiation. . . . The Papacy will succumb; it will fall beneath the sacred knife forged by the Fathers of the last Council. The Papal Caesar is a VICTIM crowned for sacrifice."

This triumph will be complete, wrote the French Mason Riandey later in 1946, "when the whole world will have recognized the authority of a sole agent, a universal regulator and coordinator. By what means shall this agent impose himself? Probably by war, by a third -- and let's hope -- final world convulsion."

+

Our Lady summed it all up at La Salette when she told us, "Rome will lose the faith



and become the seat of the Antichrist." How it happens is secondary. What matters is whom we decide to obey in the dilemma which is even now approaching its final denouement.

Actually, no problem is more easily settled. Soon after our Lord's Ascension our very first Pope and the Catholic Bishops gave the all-sufficient directive for such cases: Apprehended by the perverted authority of the Pharisees who flogged them and officially forbade them to preach Christ anywhere in their jurisdiction, St. Peter and the Apostles told them simply, "We ought to obey God, rather than men" (Acts 5:29).

Particularly illuminating is the fact that St. Peter in no way denied or contested the authority of the wicked high priest, although this is what we might be led to expect, knowing as we do that our Lord constituted Peter, and not Caiphas, His Vicar. Taught by the Word of God himself, St. Peter well knew that authority does not rest on subjective causes. The Apostles didn't say they didn't have to obey the high priest because he was faithless, or abused his authority, or was unworthy of his dignity; they merely said they couldn't obey him because his commands contradicted God's.

Caiphas, like Lucifer, was a legally constituted, divinely appointed leader. His apostasy in no way deposed him from the office he held, for only God could do that, even as only the master in the parable tells the unjust steward, "Thou canst be steward no longer." Our Lord never said one word about any such deposition, wishing rather to stress the fact that He had come, as He said, not to destroy but to perfect what His Father had set up. That's the point of the whole story. Otherwise the Apostles' reply would lose all force, because it is meant to tell us under what circumstances legitimate authority should be disobeyed if one wishes to be saved. Had Caiphas not been truly high priest, there would have been no problem at all, and no need for such distinctions.

In the same Acts of the Apostles, St. Paul later gives similar witness before the high priest Ananias. Struck across the mouth on the latter's orders in council, St. Paul retorts, "God shall strike thee, thou whited wall!" using a well-known latrine-euphemism. "And they that stood by said: Dost thou revile the high priest of God?" To which St. Paul answers that he didn't know that was the high priest, and quotes Exodus: "Thou shalt not speak evil of the prince of thy people" (Acts 23:2-4), making it clear that even perverted authority must be respected.

But here again the precedent had already been set by the angels. St. Jude, writing under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, informs us providentially of a dispute which took place between St. Michael and Lucifer over the body of Moses. St. Michael, we are told, "durst not bring against him the judgment of railing speech, but said: The Lord command thee" (Jude 9), ever respectful of his superior even in his fallen state of perpetual enmity with God.

To respect an office God has established is to respect God, but this does not mean that to obey the incumbent in all circumstances is to obey God. We have our Lord's own injunction, "According to their works do ye not," to forbid us in cases where we would be led into sin. We owe no "personal" allegiance beyond that dictated by the office.

To believe so is to fall into the toils of the enemy, who like Abbé Roca banks on a specious "personal Infallibility" of the Pope he describes. By attaching us to the person of the officer above the office is precisely the gambit which will be used to detach us from God. The fallen angels followed Lucifer's personal wishes. So did the Talmud Jews who aligned themselves with Caiphas and Ananias. So also will the apostates of the latter times follow the personal wishes of the Antichrist seated on the chair of Peter, largely because these will coincide with their own sinful inclinations.

"Knowing that he has but a short time" (Apo. 12:12), the satanic prelate will, like the unjust steward, curry favor with sinners, being lavishly permissive, granting dispensations of all kinds where debts contracted with the divine Master are concerned. Using the prerogatives of stewardship, we can expect him to encourage us to cheat on our accounts and short-change the Lord, as in the parable. Many will undoubtedly do so, hiding behind his authorization, but although the parable doesn't say so, we can be sure that honorable debtors do not take this advantage, considering themselves bound to the contract they made.

In the moral economy God has set up we are given superiors to facilitate our obedience to His laws. In lawful and indifferent matters, not only is there no conflict, but a divinely bestowed means of helping us break our rebellious wills. The essence of obedience remains, nevertheless, in obeying God above all things. To obey commands contrary to God's as manifested in the constant Tradition of the Church is quite simply sin. And with sin we fall

deeper under the jurisdiction of the enemy, ending by "receiving him into our houses," ultimately worshipping him.

+

And Lucifer means to be worshipped. This is the sole end of his stratagems and machinations to control the wealth and power of the world. It is to this end the unjust steward bribes us with the easy way out of our commitments. He gave himself away when he confronted our Lord in the desert, promising Him the whole world "if falling down thou wilt adore me." To which our Lord replied with the text from Deuteronomy, "The Lord thy God shalt thou adore, and him only shalt thou serve."

To see this terrible tableau in full perspective, we must remember that Satan here, as first-appointed prince of God's angels, was due some measure of deference from our Lord's Humanity. It's clear it was accorded by the mere fact that the temptation in the desert was permitted -- but it stopped short of sin. Our Lord set the example of proper obedience not only here, but in all his dealings with the priests and rulers in Jerusalem. For details, read the Gospels.

That Satan does find worshippers is only too evident in world history. Rites have been devised for him, hymns sung to him. Excellent poetry has been composed in his honor. Some sonnets composed in 1883 by Stanislas de Guaita, founder of the kabbalistic Order of Rose-Croix, are too blasphemous to quote, but perhaps this one, freely translated, will give some idea where false adherence leads:

As for you, Lucifer, star from heaven fallen,  
Intelligent splendor into darkness thrown,  
Angel bearing high unmastered wrath  
And filling every heart with cries seditious,  
Through you alone have I known the forgotten contempt  
Of the Lord and His detestable Power;  
Have I felt -- skeptic, scorner, nearly atheist --  
The unutterable pleasures of radiant love.  
You opened to me the sea of deep delights  
Whose delirious waves none has known to exhaust,  
You taught me to taste the charms of hell.  
One suffers, 'tis true; still one rejoices:  
For one's bile can be slavered there. O Lucifer,  
My executioner to-morrow, I honor, I love you. (from "The Black Muse")

Ugh! Yet such homage as this, offered secretly in dark corners by a few tortured initiates, will hardly satisfy Lucifer's pride. For several generations already he has been set at the center of a web of secret societies as the God to be adored and served. Many of their members are sadly unaware of it, however, for he is carefully hidden under stage dressing and equivocal terminology which the less intrepid are left to interpret according to their own beliefs, that they may do his bidding without murmuring.

Claude de Saint-Martin, high priest of mystical Masonry, deplored that his god could not be confessed openly. "How I would like," he mourned in 1782, "to lay aside the veil with which I cover myself, and pronounce the NAME of this benevolent cause, strength and excellence itself, on which I would like to set the eyes of the whole universe! But although this ineffable being, the key to nature, love, and the happiness of the simple, the torch of the wise, and even the secret support of the blind, never ceases to support men in all his steps, even as he supports and directs the whole action of the universe (!), still the NAME which would make him best known would suffice, should I proffer it, to cause the greater number to disdain to lend faith to his virtues and to distrust my entire teaching: thus, to designate him more clearly would put off my aim of having him honored."

So little doubt is there about the identity he has in mind, however, he says, "I prefer therefore to rely on the penetration of my readers, well persuaded that despite the coverings with which I have shrouded the truth, that intelligent men will be able to grasp it, true men will be able to taste it, and even corrupted men will at least not be able to keep from sensing it." Indeed not!

+

A century later Abbé Roca could boast, "I declare that we are reaching the definitive end of the old religious, political and economic order, and I announce the imminent beginning of a cycle entirely new from every point of view in the Church, the state, the family, and all circles of human activity."

Quotations thus far have been taken as cited by Pierre Virion in LES FORCES OCCULTES DANS LE MONDE MODERNE and MYSTERIUM INIQUITATIS. The author concludes the latter by explaining, "We have called it the Mystery of Iniquity because this theology of the devil uses Christian terminology, parodies the mysteries of Christ, affects to profess the true Catholicism which the successors of Peter are supposed to have betrayed, because for the destruction of the weak their "renewal of all things", including the Roman faith, is only a doctrine invented by the infernal Rosicrucian sect under the motto Jesus mihi et omnia.

Aspiring to rule the world, and especially to bring his primordial enemy the Catholic Church to worship him, Lucifer must have his Mass. And it must be offered openly and publicly. At first, of course, those he inspired would do so perhaps unknowingly, under the equivocal "coverings" Saint-Martin advised for more thorough penetration into the rank and file.

Quite understandably, the Novus Ordo Missae aroused a storm of protest from the faithful who had been nurtured on the dogmatic precisions of the ancient rite as canonized by Pope St. Pius V. It didn't take them long to note that the new ritual embodied such oddments as the Jewish blessing at meals, a Protestant form of narrative Consecration, a Masonic hand-shaking ceremony and numerous other oddities. Also noted was the omission of some very significant elements, among them the hallowed phrase Per eundem Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum Filium Tuum, Qui Tecum vivit et regnat in unitate Spiritus Sancti Deus, which identified plainly the God we mean to address. Nor do we any longer beg God to accept our sacrifice as He did the offerings of the holy Abel, Abraham and Melchisedech. Rather we now offer "the fruit of the earth," which in Genesis specifically constituted the offering of Cain!

Perhaps the most significant omission, however, was the first one, subtracted from the ancient Mass even before the new one was imposed: that of the Psalm said at the foot of the Altar before Mass begins: Quia Tu es, Deus, fortitudo mea: quare me repulisti, et quare tristis incedo, dum affligit me inimicus? "For Thou, O God, art my strength, why has Thou forsaken me? And why do I go about in sadness, while the enemy afflicts me?" The Enemy doesn't like such prayers.

As he himself fell through desire for greater excellence, so does he tempt us. He dangles before our eyes the great(er) good of universal brotherhood, where all differences will be levelled in one unified act of worship -- of him. His herald Abbé Roca envisaged, "A new Christianity, sublime, large, profound, truly universal, absolutely encyclopedic, which will certainly end . . . by bringing all heaven down to earth, by eliminating all frontiers, sectarian blocks, local churches, ethnic and jealous, devisive places of worship, pockets where the suffering molecules of the great social body of Christ are kept prisoners of Caesar (the Catholic Pope)."

To achieve this universal ideal, the Mass above all else must be divested of "sectarian" content, and Christ of His divinity. As we have seen, according to Roca -- closely followed by Teilhard de Chardin -- Christ is not the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, but "the whole Universe and especially all Humanity, or better still, the numberless Series of humanities on the march." By gradually bending these to his worship, does Lucifer perhaps hope to bring the Sacred Humanity itself to heel? Who knows what his pride contemplates!

+

We do know, however, that the Offertory of the new Mass twice addresses a certain Domine, Deus universi. And the people are made to respond: Benedictus Deus in saecula.

Who is this "God of the universe" to whom we now offer "the fruit of the earth, work of human hands, that it may become bread of life for us?" Who is he to whom we offer "the fruit of the vine," here again "the work of human hands," that in turn "it may become our spiritual drink?"

The faithful child of the Church will insist the God of the Universe is the Triune God, Maker of heaven and earth and of all things visible and invisible, whose Son became Man and died for us, whose Body and Blood we continue to offer in Holy Sacrifice.

No doubt this is the God the faithful are addressing in their hearts. The 18th Dogma of the Kabbala, however, as cited by Abbé Roca, says otherwise: Demon est Deus universus. "The God of the universe is the devil." How well did our Lord diagnose the plight of the Samaritan woman with the five "husbands" when He told her, "You adore that which you know not!" (John 4:22).

It's easy enough to show how the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass has been transmuted into a Protestant service, indeed far worse than any Luther or Cranmer devised. Nor is it difficult to show the part played by Protestantism, Talmudism, Masonry, occultism and faithless Modernism in spawning the questionable doctrines which collaborated in its conception. These forces have been in the world for generations, many times anathematized by Popes and Councils as tools of Satan. To them can be applied what Scripture said of Samaria, to which our Lord referred at the well: "These nations feared the Lord, but nevertheless served also their idols: their children also and grandchildren, as their fathers did, so do they unto this day" (4 Kings 17:41). They are, in other words, idolators, for even those who call themselves Christians worship a Christ-effigy made to their own specifications.

Only Catholics can say what our Lord said to the Samaritan woman, "We adore that which we know!" To adore otherwise is to adore Lucifer, under whatever aspect he pleases to hide himself. He it is who wants to be like God, authoring all our aberrations. When will we remember that "our wrestling is not against flesh and blood," be these Protestants, Masons or whoever, "but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the world of this darkness, against the spirits of wickedness in the high places!" (Eph. 6:12).

As Lucy of Fatima in 1958 asked Fr. Agostino Fuentes, postulator of the Cause of Francisco and Jacinta, to tell the world Satan is preparing to wage his last decisive battle, and no one must hope to be rallied to prayer and penance by the Holy Father, bishops, priests or religious superiors. Each must be prepared to work and pray for Christ the King on his own initiative under the sign of the Woman beneath which the good angels first triumphed in heaven.

"The great sign of the Woman," says Ven. Agreda, "served the good angels as a shield and as arms of battle against the evil ones; for at the sight of it, all their power of reasoning weakened and was brought to confusion and silence, since they could not endure the mysteries and sacraments contained in this sign."

In her person Mary the Mother of God is the essential symbol of the unity of the Church. She is the Mother of the Papacy, whose authority and infallibility are rooted in her impeccability. In her alone the unity and integrity of the Church subsisted at the foot of the Cross when the first Pope defected, and in her alone shall it be found when the Antichrist assumes the coveted Chair. For, "Just as by divine power this mysterious Sign appeared," says Agreda of the heavenly battle, so also now the other figure or sign of the dragon appeared, in order that thus transformed he might be ignominiously hurled from heaven amid the terror and fright of his followers and amid the astonishment of the holy angels."

As it happened before, so shall it happen again, so that this time "the manifold wisdom of God may be made known to the principalities and powers in heavenly places" not only through St. Michael and our Lord, but "through the Church" (Eph. 3:10).

OUR FATHER, WHO ART IN HEAVEN . . . THY KINGDOM COME . . . ON EARTH AS IT IS IN HEAVEN.

+

---

Copies of this article and others on similar subjects available at 50 cents each postpaid from: Big Rock Press, R2 Box 158, Leesburg, Va. 22075. Write for listings.